

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated December 11, 2006.

In the Office Action, claims 1-18 are noted as pending in the application, claims 15 and 16 stand rejected, no claims are objected to and Claims 1-14, 17 and 18 are allowed. Applicants appreciate the indication that some of the claims are allowed. No claims have been withdrawn from consideration.

Objections

The Office Action indicates that all formal requirements must be complied with or specifically traversed. Applicants are unaware of any outstanding formal requirements and therefore cannot address this part of the Office Action.

Rejections

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of USP 603,547 (Wolff). Claim 15 has been amended and claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form. All claims should now be allowable.

Claims

Consider now the claims in the application. Claims 1-14, 17 and 18 are allowed and will not be discussed further.

Claim 15 is an independent apparatus claim and recites in part:

“a wringer surface joined to the first depending support wall along a line at least partly closer to the upper support wall than the free surface, and having at least one wall defining an opening through the wringer surface, wherein the wringer surface includes a first portion that is substantially flat and a second portion that is curved and terminates at a free edge and wherein the curved second portion has side edges that are substantially free edges forming a substantially open-sided channel.”

None of the cited references taken singly or in combination teach or suggest the claimed combination, the recited elements quoted above, or that “the curved second portion has side edges that are substantially free edges forming a substantially open-sided channel”. The *Wolff* reference shows opposing side sections or wings 11 that close the side edges of the mop receptacle “B”, resulting in greater restriction on use of the wringer than that of the presently claimed apparatus. Claim 15 is patentable over the prior art.

The claim16 has been rewritten as an independent claim incorporating the elements of original independent claim 15 and is asserted as being patentable. *Wolff* fails to teach or suggest that a “free edge of the second portion is at a lower vertical position than the line joining the wringer surface with the first depending support wall.” Claim 16 is patentable over the references, taken singly or in combination.

Reconsideration of the application and claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Early notice of allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

This response is being filed with a Second Information Disclosure Statement and A Three-Month Extension of Time.

Application No.: 10/826,166
Amendment dated: June 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: December 11, 2006
Atty. Ref.: 430165-092

Please charge any additional fees that may be due or credit any overpayments to our deposit Account No. 50-0655. A duplicate copy of this document is enclosed. If a petition is required in conjunction with this paper, please consider this a request for such a petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 11, 2007

/James A. Henricks/
James A. Henricks
Registration No. 31,168

HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, CA 90245-4737
310-563-1456
310-563-1460 (fax)
jhenricks@hsh-iplaw.com (Email)